A Report on the Maryland State Planning Commission

November 1958

A REPORT

ON THE

MARYLAND STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

Prepared by

V. O. Key, Jr.
Professor of Government
Harvard University

November 1958

MARYLAND STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

Joseph Meyerhoff, Chairman
Member from Central Maryland

E. Dale Adkins, Jr.
Member from Eastern Shore

George M. Anderson
State Board of Health

Robert O. Bonnell
State Roads Commission

John B. Funk
Member from Western Maryland

Louis L. Goldstein
Legislative Council

James J. O'Donnell
Department of Public Improvements

Alvin Thalheimer
State Board of Public Welfare

Richard C. Zantzinger
Member from Southern Maryland

I. Alvin Pasarew
Director

Letter of Transmittal

Littauer Center M-5,
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts,
November 6, 1958

Mr. Joseph Meyerhoff, Chairman
Maryland State Planning Commission
100 Equitable Building
Baltimore 2, Maryland

Dear Mr. Meyerhoff:

I am transmitting herewith a memorandum setting forth the principal findings of an examination of the work of the Maryland State Planning Commission conducted at your request. A few summary observations are in order at this point.

The basic conception of state planning has great merit, but the effectuation of the idea has most rarely matched its promise. In their quest for a mission of usefulness and for survival, many state planning agencies have converted themselves into administrative units whose work is entirely lacking in planning content.

In its review of capital improvement projects the Maryland State Planning Commission has developed a program which is, as such things go, an extremely useful, concrete activity. It constitutes a continuing and recurring operation around which could be built a broader planning process, neither nebulous nor ivory towered, but of genuine practical value to the State government.

The achievement of the possibilities, some of which are set out in this memorandum, is not a matter to be accomplished at a single stroke by legislation, although minor statutory changes are recommended. The job is not the work of a day but one for sustained and patient attention to administration by the Commission, by its staff, and by departmental officers with planning responsibilities. In this they will need the continued support of the Governor and General Assembly. Fortunately, both the Governor and the General Assembly in recent years have given encouraging support to the work of the Planning Commission in its capital programming and have thereby set sound precedents for their successors.

I should like to record my warm appreciation to you, to the members of the Commission, and to its Director and staff for assistance in the conduct of my inquiries. I am also indebted to many other State officials and citizens for information, advice, and counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

V O Key

V. O. Key, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A REPORT ON THE MARYLAND STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

About a million persons will be added to the population of Maryland by 1975. Thus, the prospects are that in the next 15 years or so the State will gain a population about equal to that of Baltimore in 1950. Population forecasting is a branch of soothsaying, but, given the trends of the immediate past, such estimates have more than a touch of plausibility.

Growth in population alone will create increased requirements for all types of public services, ranging from pre-natal care to provision for the aged, from recreation facilities to institutions for the confinement of the incorrigible. The problem of providing adequate public services is certain to be complicated by a population redistribution, a movement that has already proceeded far enough to create critical problems in the new semi-urban swath that cuts across the State from Washington toward Wilmington. The problems generated by the growth and redistribution of population will be compounded by changes in the technology of government, in the extent and kinds of public services, and by changes in the State's economy.

This memorandum represents an attempt to suggest ways and means by which the Maryland State Planning Commission can play a more effective role as the State government seeks to foresee and to cope with the problems that are sure to come. The questions that the preparation of such a memorandum raises are by no means simple. To plan is to foresee, and the capacity of governments to look very far ahead is limited. They are usually, like the rest of mankind, scarcely able to keep up with what has already happened. The question of the place of the Planning Commission in the State government is also complicated by the fact that the Commission has been involved in some political squabbles and has been a minor issue in the recent gubernatorial campaign. To all these matters must be added the fact that there

is no generally accepted pattern of organization and operation of state planning to provide a model for practice in Maryland. Even if there were, it would not necessarily fit the local necessities.

STATE PLANNING GENERALLY

Although the peculiar circumstances of the Maryland situation must be controlling in this report, the background of state planning generally is of relevance in the consideration of the local problem. The average citizen who reads the materials on state planning may conclude that this must be an esoteric activity whose nature and purpose are not comprehensible to ordinary mortals. He may, in fact, become dubious about the utility of the whole enterprise. In practice, some state planning agencies have managed to carve out for themselves a role of usefulness, which differs from state to state, while others, less imaginative and resourceful, have been liquidated, as they deserved.

Background in City Planning

In its origins state planning was influenced by city planning and many of those active in the initiation of state planning were professional city planners. As state planning agencies have evolved since their beginnings in the 1930's some of the confusion about their role as they groped for a definition of purpose and for a regularized status in the apparatus of state government came from the supposition that state planning should be city planning only on a larger scale. Yet from the scope and nature of state functions state planning must differ sharply from city planning. These basic differences ought to be set out as clearly as possible as an aid to the avoidance of further obfuscation from a confusion of the two types of activities.

A major product of city planning is a so-called "master plan." From a comprehensive view of the city and its lines of growth, the practitioners of the art of city planning can lay out schemes for the location of

the principal transportation arteries, can plot areas of land use in a manner to separate industrial, retail, and residential areas, can suggest the points at which civic centers and other public facilities, such as schools, might best be located, can suggest areas to be developed as parks and recreation areas, and can project the development of other public facilities. All these undertakings in a limited and congested space must, of course, be related to each other, a consequence not likely to occur if each city department is left free to pursue its own inclinations. In practice, city planning is in part a matter of guiding future urban development; in part, a matter of trying to undo undesirable developments of the past.

The labors of the city planners can be summarized on a map or maps which show types of land use, the location of thoroughfares, at least the approximate location of the principal public facilities, present and projected, and other such matters. Once such a master plan has been contrived, a problem that vexes city planners is how to induce the operating departments of the city government to abide by the plan. The school board may insist on constructing a new high school astride the path of a projected major street. Parks and open spaces must be forever defended against other city departments which would appropriate them to their purposes. The zoning authorities are under ceaseless pressure to modify their land use regulations to permit industrial and business encroachments on residential areas. And the planners themselves constantly revise their plans for, wise though they may be, they are never wise enough to foresee all the problems of a growing city. Yet, in any case, the master plan provides a framework or a standard for the appraisal of individual projects and undertakings. The plan permits an answer to the question, Does a particular project fit into the general plan and occupy a sensible relation to its other parts?

State Planning: Scope and Technique.

From the nature and scope of state functions, state planning activities must differ in coverage and to a considerable degree in technique from city planning. The variety of state activities is wider than that of municipal functions. The state must plan its programs and policies in fields ranging from highway construction, through banking regulation, to the care of the mentally ill, and in many of its activities physical facilities are of only too incidental, if any, consequence.

State planning does not have to concern itself dominantly as does city planning, with the interrelations of physical structures and related services in a relatively small and densely populated area. Instead, the state's activities are spread over a large area; and problems of zoning of land for different uses are largely beyond its purview. Hence, except perhaps for the most highly urbanized states, state planning cannot eventuate in a "master plan" comparable to that for a city. This is, of course, of basic consequence for the central state planning agency. When it reviews individual departmental projects, it has no general scheme or framework comparable to a city's master plan against which to judge them.

Given the diversity of state functions and the spatial and ecological circumstances of their performance, the urgency of interrelating or fitting together physically the programs of different operating departments is not so pressing as it is in the congested confines of a city. To a degree state departments can plan their work independently of the intentions of other departments, although more coordination is in order than most heads of departments cheerfully concede. Even so that coordination often involves policies rather than physical structures. In one sphere, of course, the aspirations and programs of all departments do collide and that is as they compete for funds.

While there is a place within a state government for a non-operating unit concerned with planning in general, it must be conceded that in their quest for a role of usefulness state planning agencies have undertaken the most varied activities and have assumed the most diverse administrative forms. An indication of some of the types of work that state planning agencies have undertaken will suggest the range of their interests.

Studies of Resources and Their Utilization. From time to time an analysis of a particular resource and its utilization provides a framework for the development of programs for a number of state departments. Thus, an analysis of land and of its uses may permit the development of programs of forest, park, and recreational development. And in states with large sub-marginal agricultural areas such analyses may provide guides for other departments whose programs may affect the level of population of sub-marginal areas. Similarly, studies focused around the supply and demand for water may provide basic data for the guidance of public as well as private programs to meet future needs. One of the difficulties with analyses centered on resources such as land and water is that the policies affecting the use of resources are often federal matters and the linkage of state planning and federal action is an imperfect art.

Programming of Capital Improvements. Some state planning agencies provide leadership for the state departments in the development of long-range capital improvement programs. The impetus for this type of activity came from the supposition that advance planning of works would permit rapid increases of public outlay in times of declining private economic activity. Yet the advance planning of capital outlays has merits quite independent of its usefulness in the management of expenditures to offset economic recession. Whatever utility it has for counter-cyclical expenditure policy may be regarded as a valuable but cost-free by-product.

Functional Plans. In varying degrees of collaboration with the state departments concerned state planning agencies from time to time conduct studies as a basis for plans for functions that are shared by several operating departments. Thus, a plan for recreational facilities and services may set out a more or less coordinated program to be carried out by the park department, the forestry department, the wildlife agency, the highway department, and perhaps other agencies. Or a plan for meeting the needs for higher education may take into account the prospective total needs of the State and assign pieces of the total task to existing and proposed institutions.

Area Plans. On occasion state planning agencies have taken the leadership in the development of plans for the major governmental functions as they affect a particular area of the state. This kind of endeavor most frequently concerns depressed or problem areas. The logic of the area approach is that by examining the problems of the area along with the impact of all governmental programs upon it, plans may be made for a concerted and coordinated attack by all concerned with the area.

Departmental Planning. From time to time state planning agencies conduct studies and formulate plans for the work of a single state agency. The operating department often lacks the personnel and, on occasion, the inclination to do advance planning and in varying degrees state planning agencies have filled the void.

Local Planning. Some state planning agencies advise and assist municipalities and counties in their planning activities. This may be principally a role of education, advice, stimulation; or the state may assign technical personnel to serve on short-time assignments to municipal planning bodies. As an incident to its housing finance activities the federal government now makes grants to aid certain cities and other local authorities in planning and the federal statute prescribes that these funds shall be

channelled through a state agency.

Economic Development and Promotion. A major change in function in many planning agencies has been their conversion into economic development and promotional agencies; with that conversion they have usually ceased to be planning agencies. The economic development function often consists in large measure of advertising the industrial advantages of a state. These endeavors, it is reported, are readily marketable to political leaders and ample funds for their support are usually forthcoming. An incidental factor in the smooth sailing of appropriation requests is that governors take on an inner glow when they see their photographs in advertisements in the New York Times welcoming industry to their state. That such activity has any effect on the location of industry has not been conclusively established.

Consequent Administrative Problems. The state planning agencies that have become only promotional agencies present no special administrative problems. Such an agency is simply another operating department. Those planning bodies, however, that actually perform planning functions encounter administrative problems most troublesome both in theory and practice. From the sketchy statement of their activities it is evident that many of their endeavors involve relations of leadership, of collaboration, of coordination, and, on occasion, even of control of the operating departments of state governments. The survival of these agencies and their success in the achievement of their objectives has depended on their proper management of their relationships with the governor, with the operating departments, and with the legislature. From their failure to solve these problems a goodly number of state planning commissions have either died off or have survived only by converting themselves into promotional agencies.

PLANNING IN MARYLAND

From what has been said about the scope of the problem of planning for the development of state activities, it is plain enough that no single agency can--or should--do all the planning for a state. An administrative dispersion of authority for planning exists in Maryland as in all states. A brief indication of the principal points of planning authority within the state will help lay the groundwork for a consideration of the problems of the State Planning Commission in the state's planning cosmos.

Operating Departments

The operating departments, i. e., those that perform services directly for the public, such as the State Department of Health, have a responsibility for planning their own operations and for the formulation of recommendations for legislation to enable them to meet their future program needs. There seems to be no reason to question earlier findings that the planning activities of the Maryland State departments are, to say the least, highly uneven. In some instances they are practically non-existent. Yet it is also correct to say that over the years as the departments have formulated their capital improvement programs and presented them to the Planning Commission they have been compelled more and more to think ahead. In some instances a marked change in departmental outlook has occurred over the past ten years.

Certain kinds of problems in planning within operating departments recur so frequently that they reflect tendencies, if not laws, of administrative behavior. The chief of these is that the demands of their day-to-day work so monopolize the energies and attention of the chief administrators of the department that they never manage to look far beyond the steps that must

be taken tomorrow. The pressures upon them tend to limit their attention to spot problems. They may rarely have the opportunity, even if they are so inclined, to take a long look at the directions in which their program is moving. Nor are they able to back off and examine their operations comprehensively and objectively. This sort of phenomenon is, of course, not limited to governmental agencies but is common to almost all organizations. The problem tends to be especially acute in small organizations which are unable to set up specialized staffs devoted to data collection, analysis, and planning. Even in larger organizations, without the most capable general direction, planning is apt to be neglected.

Beyond such limitations created by the influences under which departments of necessity operate, other factors limit the planning capabilities of individual departments. In some instances a single department cannot plan in isolation; an external point of leadership and coordination is required to stimulate joint planning by two or more agencies. Furthermore, Maryland operating departments may have a peculiar problem flowing from their frequent reliance on career departmental direction; career departmental leadership may exist in legal form or in fact because the gubernatorially-appointed departmental heads leave everything to their career deputies. Career direction has its desirable results in routine departmental administration, but it may not lead to the development of plans and the aggressive promotion of policy to meet emerging problems. Career men are often in no position, even if so disposed, to assume the political risks associated with the public advocacy of new plans and programs. If the politically expendable departmental director or board does not provide policy leadership, their career subordinates have no effective means for the translation of their experience and recommendations into action.

Ad Hoc Commissions

Most of the study of larger questions and most of the contrivance and advocacy of new programs and policies in Maryland is performed by *ad hoc* commissions. A familiar pattern seems to be that by long neglect the level of performance of some state activity leads to a situation so bad that everybody recognizes that something has to be done. The Governor appoints a commission composed of leading citizens to investigate and to recommend. The commission whips together a small staff, a handful of its members give unselfishly of their time, energies, and intelligence, and a report (sometimes printed at the expense of a few of the more solvent members of the commission) is issued. The standing of the commission often is such as to assure that its recommendations will be accepted.

Among students of administration the fashionable attitude toward *ad hoc* commissions is critical, yet Maryland governors have been able to command for these commissions the services of many public spirited citizens of outstanding ability and devotion to the public weal. And the commissions doubtless perform a valuable function of leadership of public opinion on the questions with which they deal. Such bodies will always have their uses, but more continuous and forward-looking planning within the state administration would make less frequent the situation in which a moribund state department permits problems gradually to develop until a crisis occurs and it becomes necessary for a governor's commission to drum up public support for a multi-million dollar crash program to meet the accumulated needs.1/

1/ A catalog of planning activities should also include the fact that, on the legislative side, the Legislative Council engages in a good deal of short-term, spot research and planning of great value.

State Planning Commission

In its earlier stages the Maryland State Planning Commission concerned itself with a wide range of questions,[2/] but in recent years it has concentrated on a few types of activities. Its principal recent activities have been:

1. The work of the Committee on Medical Care. This committee, while administratively attached to the Commission and supported from the Commission budget, has been in large degree an autonomous body which has performed research and planning services in the broad field of medical care, public health, and related activities. The Committee will be treated at length later in this point. It is sufficient to say here that the Committee has, since its creation under the auspices of the Commission, played a most significant role in the development of State policies in the areas of concern to it.
2. The Commission proper, that is excluding the Committee on Medical Care, has come to devote the major portion of its attention and staff resources to the capital improvement program. The Commission operates in effect, though not in form, as a budget office for capital outlays other than those for highway construction.

2/ Inspection of the list of its publications issued by the Commission will give an impression of the shift in the focus of its activities over the years. Although to make a proper appraisal of the contribution of the Commission as an institution would require an examination of its work over several decades, my inquiries have been limited principally to its current activities. Thus, a full inquiry would have to include a look at the Commission's pioneering report of 1937 on the Baltimore-Washington-Annapolis Area and its influence on subsequent developments in that region.

3. The Commission has a statutory duty to assist and advise local planning agencies. The Director has over the years advised local authorities in the establishment of planning boards. Currently the major activity in this field is that of the special staff conducting studies for the Baltimore Regional Planning Council, a body working under the aegis of the Commission and supported in part by federal funds. The product of this activity promises to be a significant contribution to the serious planning problems of the Baltimore region.

If we ignore for the moment the work of its Committee on Medical Care, the State Planning Commission may be regarded as chiefly a central agency for the review of capital improvements proposed by the operating departments and for the recommendation of an annual program of capital outlays for the State. The principal characteristics of this activity should be clearly understood for it is a base which may, or may not, be built upon in the enlargement of the Commission's usefulness.

All proposals by State institutions, departments, and agencies for capital improvements, except those by the State Roads Commission, are required by law to be submitted to the Planning Commission by July 1 of each year. The Planning Commission reviews the requests and their justifications, the Commission itself visits the principal institutions, and holds hearings at which departments seeking project approvals may be heard. The statute requires that the Commission submit its recommendations to the Department of Budget and Procurement by September 15. A technical compliance with this requirement occurs with the submission of the outlines of a capital improvement budget by the prescribed date;3/ the full report of the Commission is

---

3/ Amendment of the statute to fix the date of report to the Department of Budget and Procurement at October 1 instead of September 15 would be advantageous.

then completed in the interim before the meeting of the General Assembly. That report includes among other things a program of improvements recommended for the following fiscal year and a list of the projects rejected or deferred together with brief statements of the reasons for actions taken. In practice the Director of Budget and Procurement sits with the Planning Commission as it considers the capital improvement program. When the program reaches him formally he need not subject it to extensive review, although he clears with the Governor those elements of the program raising new or policy questions.

The Maryland State Planning Commission has won some acclaim for its capital improvement programming. A review of the successive programs proposed by the Commission and of the policies and practices it has developed can only lead to the judgment that it has made considerable progress. The results include a more rigorous justification of individual projects, a more careful planning of projects by the departments, several general budgetary policies, and an unusually informative documentary presentation of data to the Governor and the General Assembly as a basis for decisions on appropriations for capital purposes. All things considered--the size of the staff and other circumstances--the Commission has made a more positive contribution than is generally recognized in the State.

Yet the nature of the Commission's contribution should be made most explicit. In its review of departmental capital proposals the Commission operates in the main in the spirit of a budgeting agency rather than in the manner of a planning agency. In its review the Commission, unlike city planning agencies, has no master plan against which to test or appraise individual projects. Ordinarily it does not even have any comprehensive plan for the work of the individual department to enable it to judge how particular projects fit into the long-run program of the department. Given this

absence of such concrete planning criteria to apply in its review, the Commission does what it can, i. e., it raises chiefly budgetary or fiscal questions and the general policies it has developed are in the main fiscal and procedural policies.4/

Mention of some of the policies developed by the Commission will indicate the nature of its outlook in the review of capital improvement proposals.5/ One broad effort has been directed toward sifting out of the capital improvement program (to be financed by debt) items of maintenance and repair, short-lived equipment, and other items properly chargeable to the operating budget. In another direction the Commission seeks to assure that the ancillary costs incident to proposed works are taken into account. Thus, a new building at an institution may require additional capacity in the powerhouse. The rule has developed, now incorporated in statute, of requiring the submission of preliminary plans and outline specifications for major projects; in consequence the capital budget includes items for advance planning of projects to be submitted in later years. This practice assures firmer estimates of project costs as well as that the legislature will know better what it is doing when it authorizes major construction. As it reviewed departmental requests for employee housing at State institutions, the Commission found it advisable to formulate a general policy limiting outlays

---

4/ The Commission and its Director are well aware of the limits to the scope of their work and take advantage of the opportunity afforded by the annual review of capital requests to prod the operating departments to improve their own planning.

5/ In some instances these policies have taken statutory form. In the entire development a major contribution has been made by the Department of Public Improvements. The collaboration of the Department of Budget and Procurement and the Fiscal Research Bureau have also been important. The Department of Public Improvements represents a rather unusual State administrative agency; the creation of its predecessor, the office of State Engineer, is said to have been in part the result of the initiative of the Planning Commission.

for this purpose to the provision of housing for specified classes of employees under specified circumstances and fixing limits on the cost of such housing.6/

As an outgrowth of its review of individual capital projects the Commission has moved into the analysis of general questions of fiscal policy. Its studies of State debt led it to adopt the policy of recommending for each year projects aggregating in cost in the neighborhood of $10,000,000-$12,000,000. At the time of the adoption of this policy it was judged that for the time being additional debt in such an amount could be incurred without endangering the State's AAA credit rating. The Commission has also, on the basis of staff studies, recommended, without effect, that capital improvements be financed in part from current revenues rather than entirely by debt.7/

6/ See Maryland State Planning Commission, "Employee Housing Policy" (October, 1957).

7/ An account of the Commission's policies and practices in its capital improvement programming is included in its 1959 Long-Term Capital Improvement Program. Legislators, other officials, newspapermen, or others seriously interested in gaining an understanding of the work of the Commission should examine this document.

DIRECTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF STATE PLANNING

Much of the recent discussion in Maryland about state planning has turned around the question of how the planning activity should be organized rather than about the question of just what the planners ought to do. Perhaps if we reverse the emphasis, the organizational issues will, if not take care of themselves, become more manageable. The nature of the function to be performed influences, if it does not control, the form of organization. Thus, if the State Planning Commission is to limit itself to its present concentration on the annual capital improvement program, a case could be made for the transfer of its functions and staff to the Department of Budget and Procurement. Its present operations would be by no means alien to those of the best managed state budget agencies. A problem, not insoluble, would remain of what to do with the Committee on Medical Care.

So drastic an action is not recommended for two principal reasons. The capital improvement programming operation itself is susceptible of further refinement and development and perhaps that process can be better carried along by a staff unembarrassed by the pressures of current budgeting. The present capital planning procedures probably would not have developed had capital improvement budgeting been left solely to the Department of Budget and Procurement. More important, the capital improvement program itself constitutes a hard core of concrete activity around which might be developed a genuine planning operation. An attempt to achieve that result would be an interesting venture with no risk of loss and the possibility of substantial gains for the State.

Programming of Capital Improvements

The review of departmental projects and the recommendation of the annual capital improvement program should continue to be a basic part of the

Commission's activity. As the evolution of the capital budget operation is reviewed, one is impressed by the fact that gradually, on a case by case basis, the Commission has built up general policies that introduce a degree of rationality and order into the budgeting of capital improvements. Doubtless, by continued alertness to the possibilities additional policies can be evolved and the practices in the review of individual projects improved as well.

The possession of the responsibility of reviewing capital improvements in the form that it takes in Maryland is in one respect a great advantage to a central planning agency. That function places it in a working relationship to the operating departments and permits it, if it has the inclination, to knit itself into the whole State administrative apparatus. On the other hand, the review function carries with it certain hazards that the Commission should, and has not, guarded against. The capital programming procedure is an operating task that must be completed on schedule; the recommendations of the Commission have to be in the hands of the Department of Budget and Procurement on a specified date and the report of the Commission setting forth its actions and the reasons therefor must reach the General Assembly before it considers the bond bill. These practical necessities are such that, with limited staff, the attention of the Commission and its staff may be monopolized by the review of capital improvement projects.

A more subtle problem arises from the simple fact that the review of capital projects consists of a series of manageable, concrete items, many of them quite small. The Commission members can get their teeth into the question whether there should be a new president's residence at Salisbury State Teachers College, whether $25,000 ought to be spent at the State Reformatory for Women for a new service road and parking area, whether $75,000 ought to be spent to reenforce a bridge on the grounds of the Springfield

State Hospital, or whether the water treatment plant at Crownsville needs supplementary equipment. Such questions have to be decided, and the danger is that, since they are manageable, they will command the entire interest and attention of the Commission. They are much easier to cope with than broad questions about what kind and extent of higher education the State should have or whether the correctional system as a whole is keeping up both with the growing necessities and with the best practice in penology.

The project review function carries with it also the hazard that the members of the Commission might come to believe that their job is simply to sit back and say yes or no to proposals by the operating departments. That restricted view of the Commission's functions would cut it off from the opportunity for a genuinely constructive and creative role. It would limit the quality of state planning to the level attained by the operating departments.

Long-Range Development Programming

A recent expression of policy by the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees offers the Planning Commission an opportunity to enlarge the base of its activities now centered on the annual capital improvement program. The legislative committees in their Joint Report on the General Construction Loan Act of 1957 observed as follows:

> From their annual review of the recommended capital improvement programs, the Committees are increasingly impressed with the need for a strengthening of long-range programming on the part of the departments and institutions of the State. The establishment of long-range objectives, analysis of future problems and trends affecting operations, and the development of plans and programs for action to meet the problems and needs are basic to a determination of current needs in the way of physical facilities and the preparation of a sound capital improvement program . . . .

The committees then directed the State departments and agencies to prepare 10-year development programs to be submitted to the State Planning Commission on July 1, 1959, along with the capital improvement requests due

at that time. This broad-gauged statement constituted a legislative recognition of long-standing objectives of the Planning Commission, and it strengthens the Commission in its dealings with the operating departments.

As may be surmised from their language, the General Assembly committees contemplated the preparation by the departments and institutions of considerably more than a 10-year capital improvement program. The capital improvement program is, in a sense, a translation or consequence of the policy objectives and needs of the department or agency. Presumably a hard look at the emerging needs and problems of a department or agency can be translated into a sensible and fairly firm program of land acquisition and facility construction, which, of course, necessarily becomes less firm the further into the future it is projected. Yet the point is that the hard look must first be directed at departmental policies, the standards of service, and the probable lines of growth. Only after that has been done can one attack the programming of capital improvements. These and other related considerations have been recognized by the Commission in its circular of instructions to the departments for their guidance in the preparation of the initial 10-year programs.

The legislative directive to prepare 10-year programs creates a circumstance that can be exploited to improve the work of the State departments and of the Planning Commission. That result will not inevitably follow. If the Commission merely files the documents, the departments will not treat the procedure with the necessary gravity. On the other hand, if departmental plans become an administrative instrument with a bearing on the fortunes of the departments they will enjoy a high priority in the assignment of departmental manpower.

Precisely what the Planning Commission ought to do about the 10-year programs when they begin to flow in will depend in large measure on the

nature of the submissions, but several classes of action will probably be in order. To make the planning process a meaningful operation, it will be useful to gear the review of the annual capital improvement program to the 10-year plans. By appropriate administrative procedures it would be possible to require as a part of the justification of individual projects an indication of their relationship to the broad program of development of the department. By this means it should be feasible to pull the business of planning down to earth and to avoid the frequent situation in which plans do not have much relation to what is done.[8/]

Beyond this practice which would be of general application, the Commission will have to deal on a case by case basis with situations as they arise, and the actions it will be able to take will themselves vary. In the development of practice a good deal of trial and error will have to occur. It required over 10 years for the capital improvement review procedure to reach its present stage of development; at its initiation the shape it would take could not well be foreseen in detail. The same sort of evolution along unexpected lines will occur in the long-term planning operation. Yet some types of situations are readily predictable.

8/ An examination of the items included in the annual capital program may suggest that it will be extremely difficult to relate many of them to any long-term program. A department seeks funds, say, to renovate a building at an institution or to improve the grounds or the access roads. In such instances the Commission should at least know that the place of the institution in the program of the department has a future and the improvements are not being made merely to be abandoned once the department's program undergoes thorough reconsideration. That such projects would be proposed may seem unlikely to the citizen unfamiliar with governmental practice, yet instances do occur. The most cursory inspection of the record in Maryland in recent years reveals cases in which the Planning Commission by raising questions about an individual capital project has brought a department to reconsider its program and to decide that its needs were entirely different than what it had earlier believed. Doubtless instances have occurred when such reversals of policy should have happened but did not.

In some instances it will be apparent from a review of the programs that the department is either unequipped to do competent planning for itself or that it has devoted quite inadequate effort to the matter. In extreme circumstances a recommendation that all capital improvements be deferred until the department gets its house in order might be appropriate. More generally, probably other types of action would be in order. Often after a critical review of the departmental request and a hearing before the Commission, the department itself will undertake on its own initiative to rework its plan. In other instances technical advice and assistance to the department will result in an improvement of departmental projections of needs. needs. The odds are that the first departmental submissions under the legislative directive will be susceptible of considerable improvement.

On occasion, the correct judgment may be that the department is--and perhaps cannot be--adequately staffed to do its planning. Or a department may be so solidly set on dead center that it cannot readily be moved to meet its responsibilities. Such circumstances may make advisable an examination of the departments and its functions by a group composed mainly of non-departmental persons perhaps assisted by consultants. The Planning Commission will have open to it various ways to accomplish such an examination. In some instances a temporary Commission committee, perhaps on the model of the Committee on Medical Care, would be in order. In others, perhaps the Commission would suggest to the Governor the advisability of creating an ad hoc commission to deal with the question, although if the Commission should uniformly dispose of all hot potatoes in this manner, it would restrict the range of its own usefulness. In other instances, the department might be induced to establish under its own auspices an ad hoc committee to review its program and to aid it in its policy review and planning.

In still other instances, review of the departmental programs will make it plain that some interdepartmental coordination, interdepartmental collaboration, or planning study across departmental lines is essential. In the broad terrain of public recreational facilities, for example, the operations of several State agencies will be involved: forestry, parks, wildlife, highways, and perhaps others. Incidentally, this could turn out to be more than an hypothetical example. With the four-day week perhaps not so many years away, the need for a better exploitation of Maryland's rather varied recreational resources may become more than academic. Whatever the particular situation may be, the State Planning Commission should be in a position to assume the leadership in the establishment under its auspices of interdepartmental committees or task forces to work out co-ordinated programs of action or to set in motion in whatever form may be appropriate in the particular situation studies to develop plans to which the State agencies concerned may look to as guides in their individual operations.9/

Without such initiative by the Commission some questions may get lost between departments. Or departments that happen to be on dead center will stay there. Or questions on which the circumstances are such that it is unreasonable to expect departmental initiative to produce a policy in the interest of the State as a whole will be neglected.10/

9/ Within the Commission some feeling exists that the exertion of Commission initiative in planning is incompatible with its function in the review of departmental requests for approval of capital improvement items. Yet if the Commission's staff or an ad hoc committee of the Commission does a planning study which eventually is reflected in requests from departments for project approvals, the Commission itself can be as rigorous in its appraisal as if the proposal stemmed solely from departmental initiatiative.

10/ An example of such a question is that of the utilization of lands owned by State institutions and departments. The initiative of the departments and institutions, each with a proprietary attitude towards land in its possession, cannot be expected, as the departments work individually, to produce a rational scheme for the use of State-owned land.

These remarks make it plain that the 10-year programs will contain leads for ample work to occupy the Commission. Obiously, it cannot all be done at once; nor can it ever be completed. And if the possibilities suggested have any reality, it is clear that the business of the Commission cannot well be routinized. If the Commission is to its job, both the members of the Commission and its staff need to be alert to the opportunities suggested by the ten-year plans and to apply considerable ingenuity to the contrivance of ways and means for exploiting them.

Local Planning

The Commission has statutory authority to provide "planning assistance" to any municipality in the State "upon its request." It has never been adequately staffed for this purpose. It now has under way, however, a rather ambitious, intensive planning study of the Baltimore region, which is financed in part by federal funds.11/

A new, and urgent, problem in local planning has been created by the rapid movement of population out of the major cities, and Maryland has been acutely affected by this development. The great semi-urban ribbon stretching from Boston toward Richmond crosses the State from Baltimore to Washington. This urbanization of the countryside results from a mass population movement that makes the great westward movement of the past century look like a trickle, and what sort of pattern of population distribution we shall have when people finally settle down is by no means apparent.

Yet suburbanization has already generated serious problems in the provision of sanitary facilities, in the realm of public education, in land

---

11/ It should be noted that the Baltimore regional study involves, of necessity, collaboration among the units of local government in the region and the foundations for that collaboration were laid over the years as the Commission's Director advised county authorities on the creation of planning agencies. Once such agencies were in being, they could be brought together to collaborate in a regional planning endeavor.

use—e. g., how to keep the hotdog stands, taverns, and motels out of the new sorts of residential areas—, transportation—e. g., how to keep the diesel trucks out of the picture windows—, taxation—e.g., how will the remaining farmers manage to survive under a tax system designed to support urban services. In short, the urbanization of the countryside brings with it headaches in governmental organization, the planning of land use and public facilities, and public finance of new kinds as well as of a new magnitude.

Exactly what formula the planners should apply to all these problems, nobody knows. Perhaps the most probable outcome is that about the year 2,000 Congress will pass a semi-urban renewal act to undo what is being done by the subdividers with the enthusiastic cooperation of the populace. Nevertheless, the problem may not be entirely hopeless. The State Planning Commission could at least put staff to work to contrive ways and means of coping with the problems of the new suburbs.

To deal with the new problems a great deal of intergovernmental or regional collaboration, between cities, counties and other units of government will be essential. To bring about such collaboration requires leadership. Somebody has to identify problems, take the initiative in bringing the governments concerned together, and perhaps conduct studies to provide a basis for cooperation or common action. The State is in a better position to assume this role than is any unit of local government, and the State Planning Commission could make a real contribution in this respect. By assuming the leadership in the establishment of broad lines of development, it could aid in fixing a framework within which county and city planning authorities could operate effectively. Without such general regional schemes, local planning authorities are certain to be unable to deal with some of the major problems of local concern.

Moreover, the odds are that in the government of the new semi-

urban expanses the state government will itself take more of a hand than it customarily has in the major cities. Roadways, for example, may be provided in much greater degree by the state than has been the custom in the older urban units of government. Stirrings in Maryland already suggest that the State may be called on to perform, in a sense, the functions of a city park department for these areas. This melange of State, county, city, and special district functions will need to be tied together in some way or another, perhaps by a drastically modified version of the old-style master plan. The State Planning Commission should be staffed so as to be able to bring into collaborative relationship the State departments and local governments concerned with both particular and general aspects of the new semi-urban areas. The present analysis of the Baltimore region will demonstrate the possibilities and problems. The same sorts of problems, probably in aggravated form, exist in the Maryland fringes of the Washington metropolitan area.

In such planning for the semi-urban areas it should be possible to bring into the orbit of the State Planning Commission the planning of highways and roads. The State Roads Commission has been outside the review of capital projects, in part because of the high degree of autonomy enjoyed by the Maryland State Roads Commission, a characteristic it shares with most state highway commissions. More important, though, given the staffing of the State Planning Commission and the level of the art of state planning, there has not been much reason for putting state roads projects through the Commission procedure. Yet if, in particular areas of the state, the Planning Commission should make headway in developing plans for the semi-urban sector, it will be necessary to bring the State Roads Commission into an effective relation to the process.

Apart from the problem of planning for the Maryland section of the Atlantic Coast urban strip, the scattered smaller cities need planning

services. The predominant mode of operation of the city planning business is for smaller communities to employ private consultants for short periods to prepare city plans. In some states the planning commission is staffed to provide these services as a form of technical aid. If competent city planning personnel can be attracted to the State Planning Commission and retained long enough to provide some continuity of relations with the smaller communities, the odds are that these cities would receive better technical aid in planning than they can by the occasional employment of a private consultant. Short of such provision of technical service, the staff of the State Planning Commission can be useful to cities and counties in advising on the establishment and operation of planning agencies.

Economic Development

Since there has been discussion of the potential role of the Commission in economic development, some comment is in order about the possibilites in this direction. First, let it be said that the function of industrial promotion has no place in the duties of a State Planning Commission. Promotional endeavor is incompatible with sustained attention to the types of problems that have been set out in the earlier pages. If the State proposes to employ publicity experts to herald its advantages to industries in quest of new locations, it should attach them to some agency other than the Planning Commission. It is most doubtful, in any case, whether this sort of endeavor has any effect on the movement of industry except perhaps in the most underdeveloped states of the country.

The Commission could make itself useful by conducting economic studies to produce data for use by the chambers of commerce, the utilities, the railroads, and others who are both active and have a stake in the attraction of new industry. To be of any use to anybody, however, this work would have to be quite well done and would have to be in a measure pioneering work.

Hence, unless the Commission is prepared to put some money into this endeavor and to seek out able men to do the work, it is not advised that it enter this field.

To be of value to businessmen and to the State these economic studies would have to identify in concrete terms genuine economic opportunities or advantages of location in Maryland. No good purpose will be served by the location of enterprises which, for lack of real advantage, fold up with the first breath of general economic adversity. The larger corporations usually, but not invariably, have their own economic analysts and advisers. Hence, the prospective users of such economic studies would be chiefly the smaller and medium-sized firms.

The odds are that such economic studies could be most effectively centered on regions of the State, e. g., far western Maryland, rather than on individual small communities. Their object would be to identify factors of location in relation to market, transportation facilities, labor supply, raw materials, plant sites, going community facilities, and so forth that create opportunity for profitable enterprises of specified types to be located in the general area. Studies that yield these sorts of data require the application of a fairly high order of economic skill, which is not invariably employed. Reams of reports by bureaus of business research, development commissions, and like agencies could be accumulated to attest to the fact that much of such work is of no value in industrial location. If it is to be done, it should be well done.[12/]

For some areas of the State, analyses of economic resources and possibilities could be tied together with co-ordinated planning of the

---

12/ In the late 1930's the Commission did conduct a series of industrial studies that employed novel and ingenious techniques. World War II intervened and the industrial analyses were discontinued.

activities of some State departments within the area. The chances are that in the more or less economically depressed areas of the State some of the major opportunities are for public investment in recreational and transport facilities that would incidentally stimulate private investment and activity.13/

13/ It should be noted that the question of State policy towards industrial location raises issues of the extent to which tax policy should be manipulated to attract industry, of the possibility of State or local participation in the financing of industrial facilities, and of other such matters. If the State should adopt such policies and create an agency, such as a Department of Commerce, for their administration, the types of economic studies mentioned above should be conducted by that agency rather than the Planning Commission.

The enactment of federal area redevelopment legislation, now pending, would present to the State the problem of developing a policy on some of these questions.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

From the preceding outline of functions and potential functions of the Commission the inference flows that the operation of an effective state planning agency is a formidable administrative task. Yet it is a task radically different from that of managing a department of health or a department of welfare or any other such agency that conducts extensive dealings directly with the public. The peculiar aspects of the administration of the planning agency come in part from the fact that its dealings must be principally with other elements of the State government. It must make a success of meddling into what other officials are likely to regard as their own business. The problems of operation of a planning agency thus become problems of conduct of relations with other departments of government; those are problems that are in part matters of skill in negotiation and in part matters of bringing either superior technical knowledge to bear on a question or of bringing at least the superiority of an outside and objective view.

Given the nature of their operations, the workings of planning agencies are not apt to be improved even by the most extensive and thoughtful statutory prescription. The route to improvement is rather in the main sustained and ingenious application to problems of administration. Yet the law governing the Maryland State Planning Commission does contain some anomalies that could be corrected to some advantage. In the comments that follow suggestions for statutory revision are mixed with observations on problems of administration.

Relationships Between the Governor and the Commission

The Maryland State Planning Commission probably enjoys the distinction of being the only such agency to become a topic of debate in a gubernatorial campaign. That debate and other episodes in the recent history of the

Commission have caused a hardening of conflicting views among those concerned about the work of the Commission. The principal question at issue, at least in form, has been that of the appropriate relation between the Governor and the Planning Agency. The outlooks that have developed on this question do not bear a close relation to the administrative realities or probabilities, but the tenacity with which they are held may make it difficult to obtain agreement on a solution.

One view is that the planning agency should be an "arm of the Governor." By its critics this phrase is interpreted to mean that the Planning Commission would become a "rubber stamp" for the governor who, these interpreters of the theory seem to hold, is invariably a malevolent gentleman with determined but wrong-headed views on even the most minute questions within the purview of the Commission. Some of the Maryland advocates of the arm-of-the-governor theory seem to regard the management of the State government as about the same sort of problem as the supervision of an automobile assembly plant. That is, the scheduling or planning department should be across the hall from the boss and should work up for him the detailed instructions to the operating units of the plant so that the required numbers of the appropriate models would roll off the line by the end of the day. Whether for good or ill, governors have less control over their domains than do the superintendents of assembly plants; nor is a state administration ever so closely articulated as are the elements of an assembly operation. Nor do superintendents of assembly plants have to worry about legislatures.

Perhaps the major aspect of administrative reality overlooked in the local advocacy of the arm-of-the-governor position is the fact that the planning agency must in large degree establish and earn its own position in relation to the operating departments of the government without benefit of the governor's authority. Thus, the Commission could develop a policy, as

it has, toward the provision of employee housing at State institutions and induce the governor to issue it as an order to the operating departments. Yet the policy would not stick unles (1) virtual agreement of the affected departments had been obtained beforehand or (2) the Commission had contrived a rule so rational and so adapted to the realities that the operating departments would not dare challenge it. The orthodox administrative theory would prescribe that this procedure of executive approval or order be followed, but the operational practice would necessarily be one of the negotiation of a rational principle more or less acceptable to all concerned. Thus, agencies with functions such as those of the Planning Commission depend in the main for their effectiveness on their skill and sense in building a network of relationships with the operating departments rather than on their capacity to induce the governor to put his signature to their recommendations. And this may be especially true in Maryland where the heads of operating departments enjoy more than a little independence from the Governor. The development of the kinds of administrative relations that are implicit in the arm-of-the-governor theory is apt to occur gradually over a long period of time, if it occurs at all. Moreover, the situation in the short run is certain to vary enormously with the occupant of the Executive Mansion.

Another position on the issue runs to the effect that the Planning Commission should be entirely independent of the Governor and should occupy itself with the courageous and virtuous application of the scientific criteria of planning uninfluenced by the political winds of the moment. The truth of the matter is, of course, that no statutory gimmick can put the Commission beyond the control of the Governor, if he is disposed to control it. Further, although a painstaking and skilled study of the questions the Commission must decide yields far better results than off-the-cuff determinations, its major decisions and recommendations must by their nature be policy

decisions. To the extent that it is effective, the Commission is inevitably involved in the politics of policy, if not in the politics of who holds office.

Perhaps creation of the most appropriate working relationships between governor and planning commission would be promoted if all concerned could forget the arm-of-the-governor theory as well as the vision of the independent and insulated ivory tower and consider the concrete relationships that would be conducive to the performance of the planning function. As such relationships develop, let it be left to the processes of institutional evolution to christen them.

Some of the major types of relationships that could improve the effectiveness of the planning process may be set out. These categories are built up on the assumption that the Planning Commission will come to have wider concerns and more initiative than it has in the past. A principal assumption underlying the observations that follow is that the danger for the Planning Commission is not so much that the Governor will dominate the Commission as that he will ignore it.

1. It seems clear enough that the Commission (or its Director) should not be within range of buzzer summons from the Governor's desk. The involvement of Commission staff in the day-to-day work of the Governor's office is not compatible with the analyses in breadth and depth that the Commission should conduct.

2. Generally a systematic liaison should be maintained between the Governor and the Commission. The Chairman of the Commission customarily reviews the annual capital improvement program with the Governor before its submission to the Department of Budget and Procurement. Certain other types of

consultation with the Governor should also become customary with the Commission to the extent that such is not already the practice.

3. Major new planning studies should be cleared with the Governor prior to their initiation. If the Commission is to do the job open to it, it will conduct inquiries of which the Governor should at least be forewarned and perhaps his endorsement solicited. This procedure also has a most practical import in that the Commission will often need special funds to do such studies. Moreover, the Governor should be informed of the findings and recommendations of major studies prior to their public release.

4. The Commission should conduct such planning studies as the Governor may direct. The odds are that over the years governors will not often have broad ideas to put to the Commission for examination and recommendation. Yet to make explicit the situation as it is already in fact, it is suggested that a section be added to the planning statute: "The Commission shall conduct such planning studies as the Governor may direct." The most probable mode of operation under such a clause is that the Commission would identify a problem deserving of examination, outline what it proposed to do, sell the Governor on the idea, and present to him for signature a draft of a letter instructing the Commission to work on the problem. Or, far less frequently, the initiative might rest with the Governor in which case, in some instances, the Commission might find it advisable to suggest to the Governor that he had asked the wrong question and negotiate out a workable plan for the study of the

right question. It scarcely need be said that it would be improper for the Governor to indicate to the Commission what the answer to the question should be.

5. The Commission should call the attention of the Governor to State departments that are singularly ineffective or inactive in departmental planning.

6. A critical question arises when the Governor asks the Commission to include in the program of capital improvements a project dear to his heart but, in the view of the Commission, not well considered. Governors in situations of pressure may commit themselves to actions of whose ramifications they are not aware. The practice over the life of the capital improvement program has been for the Commission to include most of these projects albeit with reluctance. Yet the uniform testimony is also that as the capital improvement procedure has developed governors have come more and more to support the Commission by insisting that proponents of projects put their requests through the Commission procedure.

   Yet it is a safe prediction that from time to time the Commission will be confronted with the question of what to do about such requests. On occasion these episodes can be used by the Commission to suggest the initiation of a broad survey of the general problem raised by the Governor's particular project. The Commission will also need to educate successive Governors to the advantages of parrying some pressures by referral of proposals to the Commission for extended analysis. That analysis could result in the development of a broad program that would do political credit to the Governor or to the burial

of the embarrassing question of the moment. In any case, as the statutes now stand the Governor is free to include in his budget recommendations to the General Assembly any project he wishes even though it has not received the blessings of the Planning Commission. The Commission in turn is free, if it wishes, to withhold its blessings from any such proposal and to leave its advocacy clearly a responsibility of the Governor alone.

Some of the problems that arise from projects that are inspirations of the gubernatorial moment would disappear with better long-range planning. An imaginative planning agency, buttressed by solid planning in the operating departments, ought to have on hand an ample stock of well-considered undertakings from which any Governor could pick up attractive items to advocate both to his own glory and to the advancement of the public weal.

7. Apart from such individual matters, a broader and more difficult problem of policy arises in the capital improvement program. Certainly most of the items in the capital improvement program will be the same whoever the governor is; they are determined, in effect, by the immediate necessities of the going situation with respect to settled policies. Nevertheless, one governor may be strongly committed to the needs of certain minority groups; another to the improvement, say, of institutions and policies affecting the aged; and another may have another sort of policy inclination. These matters of policy preference--beyond the questions settled by technical and operating necessities--should be adequately cared for by the representation of

the governor's outlook by his appointees on the Commission. Even so, governors should be aware that their problem in impressing such broad policy views on the State government is in larger measure one of dealing with the operating departments than of managing the outlook of the Planning Commission. If projects desired by the Governor on policy grounds arrive at the Planning Commission weakly presented and ranked low in priority by the operating departments, the Planning Commission, even if it is a rubber stamp, cannot well do what should have been done elsewhere.

8. In another aspect of broad policy the relations between the Governor and the Planning Commission could be re-arranged probably to the advantage of State policy. Under present practice the Planning Commission determines the total dollar volume of capital improvements it will recommend for the ensuing year. Since the custom is to finance capital improvements by 15-year bonds, the Commission, in effect, by its recommendations fixes an important element of State fiscal policy. The Commission staff has conducted competent technical studies of the debt question and the Commission has recommended that the State finance capital improvements in part from current revenue.

Whether the State debt shall be increased; if so, by how much; whether some capital improvements should be financed from current revenues are, of course, basic issues of State fiscal policy. The burden of advocacy and of responsibility on these matters rests in large measure with the Governor. Some governors are "builders"; others "economizers"; others fall in

between these extremes. Whatever their position, even if it is one of silence, they tend to bear the burden of responsibility. Yet the present procedures do not bring the issues to the Governor or focus operating views upon him in such a manner as to facilitate his decision on these broad questions of fiscal (including debt) policy. One possibility would be for the Governor, during the period of the preparation of the annual operating and capital budget, to make a rough and tentative policy determination which, among other things, would fix an overall limit on the dollar volume of capital improvements to be recommended by the Planning Commission. Thus, in his fiscal planning the Governor would fix the size of the pie and the Planning Commission would allocate it among the departments.14/

Composition and Appointment of the Commission

In the discussion of the planning problem in Maryland considerable attention has been given to the question of the place and powers of the Commission, the size of its membership, and related matters. Given the limiting practical circumstances, whatever solution of these questions is worked out is likely to be administratively untidy. Yet some of the embarrassments of the present situation can fairly readily be corrected.

Whether the planning agency should be headed by a commission or by a single director presents a first issue. The determination of this question

---

14/ The problem of the State's fiscal policy will become more pressing in the future than it now is. If debt continues to increase, in due course the problem of what to do about its control will fall in the Governor's lap. Or, if good fortune permits a fairly uniform annual issue of new bonds, the day will arrive when the annual increment about equals the annual retirement. At that point the question of why the State is not on a pay-as-you-go policy will have the potential of political embarrassment.

depends on what we expect of the planning agency. The Commission is now essentially an advisory agency. If it is to cope with a broader range of questions, it will still be an advisory body whose recommendations will be effectuated, if at all, by the Governor, the General Assembly, or the operating departments. Its operating responsibilities are limited to the direction of a small staff which will always be small.

The question is whether we want, on the kinds of questions a planning agency should deal with, the judgment of a commission or that of its staff director. For advice on such questions there is much to be said in principle for the pooled judgment of a council of men; certainly judgment is needed on questions of policy on which staff personnel should not assume responsibility no matter how useful they may be in building up the technical data to facilitate judgment. Nor are the broad issues with which the planning agency ought to deal ordinarily questions to which the application of professional skills alone yields the answer.

In Maryland, too, the tradition seems to be that policy recommendations, if they are to have a chance of effectuation, require legitimization by the sponsorship of a body of lay citizens. An identical recommendation made by an ordinary official seems to carry far less weight. Also in the State the use of boards and commissions is customary for most agencies.[15/] Whatever may be thought of the tradition, for 30 or 40 years reorganization committees have recommended the abolition of commissions heading operating departments without marked effect.[16/]

15/ The tradition is commented upon by the Commission on Administrative Organization of the State, Summary and Final Report (1953), pp. 25-28.

16/ A whimsical suggestion picked up in the course of my discussions may have some hidden merit. Governors are besieged by citizens hopeful of the honor of appointment to one commission or another but neither eager nor able to devote much time or energy to the service of the public. To cope with this problem, the suggestion is that there be created a Governor's Council, unlimited in size but completely devoid of function. Each Governor's Councillor, however, would receive a large and elegantly phrased commission, suitable for framing, complete with gold seals and ribbons in the State colors.

These considerations lead to the recommendation that the planning agency be headed by a commission with full responsibility for the direction of the planning staff and for the performance of the planning function in much the same manner as the law now specifies.

If this broad recommendation is accepted, the related questions of the size and composition of the Commission needs to be considered. The size of the Commission is a question that can be treated only within the limitations of the Maryland circumstances. For the kinds of work the Commission should do, a membership of five or seven would be most appropriate. Such numbers can constitute a genuinely deliberative council. The universal judgment, however, seems to be that as a practical matter the present statutory requirement of several members representative of geographical sections of State must be retained. That would probably assure the continued membership of several persons on the Commission not markedly active in its work. Thus a formal membership of nine, as at present, would probably mean a working membership of not much over five.

It is also suggested that the present statutory requirement of a quorum of five be reduced to three. Such a prescription would be odd, to be sure, but it would recognize the realities of attendance at Commission meetings.17/ It would perhaps also permit the Commission to meet more frequently. In effect, perhaps an informal executive committee, sitting as the Commission, could develop to exercise more leadership of staff work than has been the custom in the past.18/

17/ If this recommendation cannot be accepted, an alternative mode of treatment would be statutory authority to the Commission to make its own rule with respect to a quorum.

18/ The average attendance at Commission meetings, 1954-1957, was 5.1 members. In 1957 of the total possible number of member-attendances (i. e., 1 member at 1 meeting), 57 per cent were present, 43 per cent absent.

The composition of the Commission presents a problem that grows out of its early history. The Commission statute provides that the membership shall include "a member of the State Roads Commission or the Chief Engineer of the Commission, whichever shall be designated by the Governor"; "a member of the State Board of Health or the Director of Health, whichever shall be designated by the Governor"; and "a member of the State Board of Public Welfare or the Director of Public Welfare, whichever shall be designated by the Governor". Since the action placing these officials on the Commission, the work of the Commission has taken a different turn. The considerations that made their membership on the Commission appropriate have been replaced by circumstances that argue against their membership. The assumption of the function of review of proposals for capital improvements results in the membership on the Commission of officials of some of the departments whose projects are subject to its review. The members concerned usually decline to vote on projects of their own departments, but this is no real solution to the problem of conflict of interests incident to their membership on the Commission. In practice, another consideration may be even more compelling. The departmental members of the Commission are themselves often part-time, citizen members of the governing commissions of their departments. They are hard pressed to spare the time to perform their departmental duties let alone master the problems within their purview as members of the Planning Commission.19/

19/ Departmental representation on agencies such as the Planning Commission is commonly justified as a convenient means for co-ordinating the work of the departments so represented. That purpose has not been served in the Maryland situation. The problem of facilitating interdepartmental collaboration might better be dealt with case by case by means ranging from staff consultation to technical committees composed ordinarily of persons below the rank of department chief.

The present membership of the Commission also includes the Chairman of the Legislative Council (i. e., the President of the Senate). In recent years he has not attended Commission meetings with notable regularity. Indeed, a legislator intimately involved in Commission deliberations and oroughly committed to its program would lack the essential room for maneu- r in the legislature itself. Liaison between the legislature and the Com- ssion is in order, but the membership of the Chairman of the Legislative uncil on the Commission has not served that purpose. The attendance of the Chief of the Fiscal Research Bureau at Commission sessions has helped to link the legislative committees and the Commission, and some systematic effort by the Commission staff would be in order to see that members of the Legislative Council were invited to attend Commission sessions dealing with questions of particular interest to them.

The Director of Public Improvements serves ex officio as a member of the Commission, but unlike the other departmental members he does not sit as an official of a claimant agency. His functions of general supervision of improvements by most of the departments makes it essential to the Planning Commission that he collaborate closely with it. His membership on the Commission should be continued.20/

It is recommended that the three representatives of operating departments on the Commission and the Chairman of the Legislative Council be replaced by members designated by the Governor without limitation as to their place of residence within the State. This transition should be made effective

---

20/ The suggestion has been made that the Director of Budget and Procurement be a member of the Commission. He functions, in effect, as a member of the Commission, a practice that should be continued, but he should not be formally a member. As the Governor's budget officer he should be free to recommend the exclusion of items of the Planning Commission's capital improvement recommendations from the Governor's budget as well as the inclusion of items rejected by the Commission.

June 1, 1959, to coincide with the conclusion of the terms of several of the present members of the Commission and thereby to avoid any supposition that the bill was intended to be ripper legislation.21/

The kinds of persons appointed to the Commission will, of course, determine whether it can capitalize on its opportunities. No statutory prescription of qualifications would be of much utility; a governor will have to use his best judgment in choice and his most persuasive salesmanship to draft the right persons for the Commission. Just what qualifications they should possess is not so simple a question. But members of the Commission need to have a general familiarity with problems of government and public policy; otherwise, they may become equipped to fill their posts only at about the end of their term. They must be willing to devote a good deal of time and thought to public questions; no governor should induce a man to serve on the Commission by the representation that the job will require inconsequential attention. They need to have some understanding of the processes of fact finding and analysis as a basis for public policy recommendations. They should not be deadset special pleaders for particular institutions or functions. They should be of integrity and standing in the community. The

---

21/ Language on the order of the following would keep statutory revision to a minimum and accomplish the recommended change. The first paragraph of Section 1 of the Commission statute could be made to read: "Section 1. The State Planning Commission is hereby created. The Commission shall consist of nine (9) members who shall be selected as follows: four persons, chosen without limitation as to their place of residence within the State, shall be appointed by the Governor for a term of four years, which shall begin upon the date of appointment and shall terminate on June 1st, 1963, and thereafter shall be appointed for terms of four years; the Director of Public Improvements of the State of Maryland shall be an ex officio member of the Commission; the other four members of the Commission . . ." and so forth to the end of the paragraph as it now stands.

The second paragraph of the section should be altered to make the quorum three and the bill should carry a clause making the amendments effective June 1, 1959.

question may be whether such paragons exist. I believe that even the most hard bitten political reporter would concur in the view that Maryland has a goodly supply of such persons who could serve the State well on a planning commission. Their type is represented by many of the men who have served on ad hoc commissions to investigate and report upon particular questions or by some men who have developed a taste for public service from their membership on commissions heading the State operating departments. Some of the medical men who have been active in the Committee on Medical Care have a turn of mind that would be serviceable over a wider range of questions. There is no lack of men who could serve ably on the Commission; the problem is to identify those with appropriate skills and interests and to pressure them into service.

None of these comments should be regarded as a reflection upon the present members of the Commission. The observations are rather intended to suggest the qualities that should be uniformly sought in persons to be appointed to the Commission and, perhaps more important, to emphasize that if the Commission is to fulfill its promise it must be a working commission.22/

22/ Some city planning commissions have found that an honorarium paid to the members for attendance at each Commission meeting induces both a regularity of attendance and a sense of obligation far beyond what might be expected for the small sums involved. It is my judgment that a fee for attendance at Commission meetings would yield a high return in intensive application to the job. An honorarium of, say, $50.00 per meeting with an annual limit of payment for attendance at a dozen meetings would probably on the average yield several thousand dollars worth of service for a few hundred dollars. The Planning Commission is, of course, itself in no position to recommend such action to the General Assembly. When the committees of the General Assembly consider the question of the Planning Commission, they should give serious attention to the matter of compensation. An experimental initiation of such a policy with a decision to review the results after two or three years might be the appropriate approach.

Relations With the Legislature

Another problem relates to the question of the relationships that should prevail between the planning agency and the legislature. It is, of course, evident that the Planning Commission can not be an agent of the legislature in the same sense as the Legislative Council. It definitely occupies a place in the administrative firmament and reports to the Governor.

Yet the Commission also has its obligations to the legislature. Its program of recommended capital improvements goes to the General Assembly as well as to the Governor. Given the fact that the General Assembly has the right of initiation of capital outlays (unlike the Governor's monopoly of initiative in the operating budget), the Commission is thrown into direct relations with the General Assembly on capital improvements. Action on the capital improvement budget depends in considerable degree on the confidence with which leaders of the General Assembly regard the Commission's recommendations. Moreover, the work of the Commission in this field is guided to a considerable extent by actions, formal and informal, by the legislature.23/

A rigorous application of the arm-of-the-governor theory to the Commission would require that it maintain only the most tenuous relations with the General Assembly. The Commission's capital improvement program would, thus, become a document signed by the Governor and transmitted by him to the General Assembly. Given the existence of going relations between the Commission and the General Assembly, the safest prediction is that the Commission could not, even if that were wished, be very well insulated from the General Assembly.

23/ Representation of the Fiscal Research Bureau at Commission meetings serves to keep the Commission informed of past actions of the legislative committees on matters under consideration and to alert it to the probable future attitudes of those committees.

The reality is that the Commission will have to manage to get along with both the Governor and the General Assembly. One of the unavoidable occupational hazards of the American public service is that the public administrator sooner or later finds himself squeezed between the legislature and the chief executive. Prudence can be about the only guide in the relations between the Commission and the General Assembly. But the question then becomes, What is prudent? The Commission's Director is available during legislative sessions to deal with questions about the Commission's capital improvement recommendations. This is as it should be, but the Director can speak for the Commission only when the Commission has adopted a position of its own. Most of these relations with the General Assembly consist, of course, in the provision of information in response to questions by its committees, and raise no great problem. When the Commission becomes involved in questions of warmly controverted policy, it would be well for the Chairman of the Commission to make the presentation to the legislative committees.

The initiative for the work of the Commission will ordinarily come from the Commission itself or from within the administrative side of the State government rather than from the legislature. Nevertheless, the facilities of the Commission ought to be available to the General Assembly if it wishes to use them. Usually the General Assembly will look to the Legislative Council or to the Fiscal Research Bureau for studies and recommendations, but it should be free to call upon the Planning Commission for studies and recommendations as it has done from time to time. The Commission statute might well include a clause: "The Commission shall conduct such planning studies as the General Assembly may direct." Such a relationship would create the possibility of Commission recommendations to the legislature at variance with the Governor's policy views, but that hazard is more hypothetical than real.

Relations With Operating Departments

A major part of the work of the Commission consists in its dealings with the operating departments of the State government. Those relationships are touched at points throughout this memorandum, but a few additional aspects merit special mention.

1. In the capital improvement program the Commission has developed fairly systematic procedures for the conduct of this phase of its relationships with the departments. It seems obvious, however, that more frequent contact at the level of technical staff of the Commission and the operating departments would iron out many minor questions which now require the attention of the Commission at its hearings on departmental proposals. If each operating department formally designated an officer at the staff level to deal with the Commission staff, these relations would be facilitated.

2. The Commission should continue to stimulate the operating departments to strengthen and improve their own planning. The forthcoming ten-year plans of the departments will provide a good indicator of which departments are in most need of encouragement to elevate the level of their own performance. Admonitions to the operating departments will probably not be enough; the Commission should be prepared to follow through with technical advice and assistance.[24/]

24/ One device that might be of utility would be for the Planning Commission staff to assemble the technical personnel of the departments concerned with planning for informal discussions of their common technical problems. Consideration of these problems on a professional level could over the long pull raise departmental performance as well as incidentally knit more closely together staffs of departments with connected or related functional responsibilities.

3. If the Commission builds up a larger staff, it should give thought to the systematization of its own relations with the operating departments. That is, what sorts of questions can be handled at the level of technical staff, with whom and on what kinds of questions should the Director deal, and at what point is the Commission or its Chairman to be involved.

Workings of the Commission

If the Commission is to approximate its possibilities, systematic attention needs to be given by the Commission itself and by its Director to the improvement of the procedures for the utilization of the Commission. A commission can be a productive group, but if it is to be so, the conditions under which it works must be appropriately arranged. Some of the considerations, possibilities, and relevant practices may be set out.

1. The Commission should not regard its role as limited to that of convening occasionally to give its blessings to the work of the Director and staff. This passive participation in the work of the agency, not uncommon among state commissions, is inconsistent with the job of the Planning Commission.
2. The Commission needs itself to take no little initiative in fixing the broad lines of work of the Director and staff. This is, of course, in part a matter of having on the Commission men with ideas and views about state problems and policies, but it is also in part a matter of recognition by the members of the Commission that their job includes more than merely following the lead of the staff. In the initiation of major studies, in the appraisal of the plans for inquiries, in the review of findings and the formulation of recommendations the Commission can act to keep the planning operation moving along as well as to

guide it.

3. The Director needs to give more sustained attention to the problem of organizing materials for presentation to the Commission. Questions deserving of the attention of the Commission should reach it in a form to facilitate its deliberations (and questions not worth the attention of the Commission should not reach it). Thus, when the Commission members assemble without having received in advance an agenda or documents on its major items, their discussion is apt to be desultory, their comments uninformed, and their judgment off-the-cuff. Or when hearings on capital improvement programs are conducted without any advance briefing of the Commission on the issues, the procedure is not likely to be illuminating or only fortuitously so. Staff memos for the Commission on the issues raised by capital proposals would definitely be in order. In short, to get the most from even the ablest Commission requires good staff work: carefully prepared information for the Commission and a skillful presentation of the issues on which the Commission's decision or judgment is required.

4. The foregoing observations on the relations of the Director and the Commission carry with them the implication that the Commission should be the boss; the Director should definitely be subordinate to it. The injection of more reality into this relationship is prerequisite to the maintenance of the policy of filling the directorship with a career man. If the Commission is regarded as facade and nothing more and its actions as in reality, the work of the Director, sooner or later a career director is in for trouble. He will be assessed with an

accountability that should be borne by the Commission. In turn, if the Commission is to bear the accountability for its decisions, it must actually be the boss. All these are only elementary maxims of public administration that are mentioned here only because it appears that they are not well understood in the local situation.[25/]

5. The Commission needs, if it moves into an enlarged sphere of activity, to keep in mind the possibility of employing ad hoc committees to conduct particular studies. The example of the Committee on Medical Care is instructive. It has created numerous committees to prepare reports and recommendations on particular problems. By this means specialist and those administratively concerned about particular questions have been drawn upon for advice and service. The Commission itself could profitably use the same administrative technique to deal with some problems. It is not suggested that the Commission cluster about itself a series of standing committees, but that ad hoc committees or task forces, serviced by the Commission staff and, when appropriate, consultants, would provide a means for getting ahead with the planning task in particular fields. These remarks have a special relevance to the earlier discussion of possible lines of development under the 10-year planning program.

25/ A problem closely related to the above broad point is that of press relations. Their conduct for an agency headed by a part-time commission presents practical problems not readily reconcilable with the principles that should ideally govern. Normally, of course, formal press releases should be in the name of the Chairman. Unless a chairman is always available and prepared to devote more time to the Commission than would normally be expected, the Director must handle most of the routine press inquiries.

Relations of Commission and Committee on Medical Care

The Commission's Committee on Medical Care constitutes an interesting instance of an institution created to deal with a specific problem which survived beyond its initial assignment to make itself useful in unexpected ways. Formed in 1940, the Committee's major purpose was to work out a system of medical care for the medically indigent, a delicate problem that required the reconciliation of divergent views within the medical profession as well as the contrivance of practical administrative arrangements for the application of acceptable policy. The nature of this assignment made it appropriate to include on the committee representatives of numerous groups in the State whose concurrence in the plan for medical care would be politically convenient as well as leaders of the medical profession and officials of State departments concerned. To serve these purposes the Committee had to be rather large and as time has passed it has become larger. Members are added from time to time, and few are not reappointed at the expiration of their term. The membership now numbers about 70.

After the completion of the task for which the Committee was established, it became evident that here was an administrative mechanism handy for a variety of purposes. The Committee has conducted a long series of studies in the general fields of public health, mental hygiene, the medical aspects of the programs of various State institutions, and related matters. It has brought together the talents of men from the State's medical schools, from the State departments with medical and medically-related problems, and private citizens with an interest in these matters. To some degree it has served as a mechanism of communication between the medical fraternity and the lay world. Its connections with the medical profession are suggested by the fact that it has been able to impose upon the Medical and Chirugical Faculty for office space. By and large the Committee is a medical body yet it has

had several laymen active in its membership and in its staff it has had both medical and lay persons with special capacities in bridging the gap between medical and lay circles.

Administratively the Committee is something of a curiosity. For most of its number, membership tends to be honorific. An executive committee of less than a dozen persons really constitutes the working committee and the executive committee has included three or four extremely able medical men unconnected with the State departments who have provided most of the driving power of the committee. In its relations to the Planning Commission the Committee has been in large measure autonomous if not independent. The Committee is, in fact, in form appointed by the Governor. A "nominating committee" prepares lists of names for appointment and requests the Chairman of the Commission to forward the names to the Governor for appointment.26/ The Committee's staff costs and other expenses are carried as an item in the Commission budget.

In its operations the Committee ordinarily appoints a subcommittee to examine a problem that has come to its attention. The subcommittee may include persons from the State departments concerned and medical and lay personnel from outside the departments. The Committee's staff, alone or with the assistance of consultants, conducts the investigation and prepares the factual basis for the Committee's consideration in arriving at its findings and recommendations. In arriving at those recommendations the non-official members of the subcommittee on occasion jog the official members and have a healthy influence on the State departments. If one regards the capital

---

26/ These procedures do not rest on statute but are purely informal. They arose from the fact that, to give an initial fillip to the work of the Committee, its creation and its membership were announced by the Governor. Legally the existence of the Committee and appointments to it are technically a responsibility of the Commission.

improvement budgeting operation as something other than "planning," most of the planning done by the Commission in recent years has been that by its Committee on Medical Care. The Commission, as it contemplates the problem of becoming more of a planning agency itself, could well examine reflectively the operations of its Committee on Medical Care.

As those familiar with administrative practice would expect, the attitude exists in some quarters that the Committee is a means by which the medical profession injects its wishes into State policies. Probably on the whole a more nearly correct estimate would be that the Committee has served as a leader of the profession on some matters and that in most of its activities it has operated either on a technical level or has dealt with questions about which most medical practitioners have no strong beliefs one way or another. Moreover, on many of the questions with which the Committee deals the medical profession is by no means so united as the layman tends to believe it to be.

The Committee's linkage with the Commission could be strengthened and the manner of handling some types of relations between them needs reconsideration. The Commission, for example, refers to the Committee for its judgment capital improvement proposals concerned with medical matters. In one instance, a proposal from a State department wound up for hearing before a subcommittee of the Medical Care Committee chaired by the bureau chief who had originally submitted the proposal to the Commission. In another instance, a departmental proposal was referred to a subcommittee chaired by the chairman of the advisory committee of the originating department. Not unexpectedly the subcommittee reports were highly favorable. This kind of operation could be regarded as an indication of an insensitivity to problems of conflict of interest; it could also, and with equal probability, be interpreted as the result of the failure of the Planning Commission to think through the

question of precisely the types of issues on capital improvements about which it could reasonably expect help from the Committee. A sharp definition of the proper role of the Committee would take care of these problems.

Another point made in appraisal of the Committee on Medical Care is that some of its planning studies deal with matters that are really the responsibility of the Department of Health or of some other State department. The inference flows from this that the operations of the Committee may even discourage the departments from trying to do themselves what they ought to be doing. Certainly in some instances the Committee on Medical Care has moved in to fill the void left by departmental inactivity, but in so doing it follows a pattern common to nearly all the State departments, medical or non-medical. Earlier reference was made to the frequency with which programs of Maryland departments were reviewed, examined, and planned by ad hoc commissions. The Committee on Medical Care, since it has been a standing committee and has done some excellent work, has merely become more conspicuous than the usual extra-departmental planning group. In any case, much of the work of the Committee cuts across departmental lines and across private and public institutional lines and could scarcely be done by a unit of a single department.

The Committee on Medical Care serves as a point around which can be mobilized leaders of the medical profession, technical experts from Maryland's medical and scientific community, public officials concerned with medically-related matters, and some lay citizens. In view of the exceptional resources of Maryland in the medical and scientific field any institution that serves to exploit these resources for the benefit of the State should be maintained and strengthened. There needs to be, of course, a constant alertness to the problem of tempering the particular drives of the specialist, and in the present practices of the relations between Commission and Committee some

problems exist which should be ironed out. The following lines of action commend themselves:

1. More frequent contact between the Commission chairman and the Committee chairman would facilitate the better utilization by the Commission of the skills and resources that the Committee can mobilize for the service of the State and at the same time keep the Committee currently informed of the broad problems faced by the Commission.

2. The Committee should be reduced in size to something approximating that of its present executive committee. The reasons for the large and heterogeneous composition of the committee at its formation no longer prevail. Moreover, on grounds of principle, it is not the best practice to maintain as a standing unit of the State government a large and representative committee whose principal utility is to lend political strength to the views of its inner core or to overawe those to whom the committee recommendations are directed. In any case, legislators have long since ceased to be impressed by letterheads carrying the names of persons who have lent their name to the cause; and it is certain that legislators will be amply impressed by the recommendations of men of the eminence of the leading members of the Committee.

   A reduction in size of the Committee will not prevent it from using non-members on special committees established to examine particular problems. It has been the practice when instituting studies of particular problems to draft the services of persons most suitable and ordinarily in due course to make them members

of the Committee. Given the practices of the Planning Commission, this sort of formal arrangement is not necessary. Thus, the Committee is a committee of the Planning Commission, but its members are not members of the Commission.

3. The present practice whereby the Committee on Medical Care is patently self-perpetuating should be modified. The choice of its members should be that of the Chairman of the Planning Commission and they should be designated for a term of two years instead of three. In practice, the Chairman of the Commission would have to act in consultation with two or three of the men active in the Committee and the reality would probably be about the same as now. Yet the Committee would be thereby protected from the charge that it is a self-perpetuating clique.

4. When the new State Office Building is completed, the Planning Commission quarters should include space for the staff of the Committee on Medical Care. The State should not impose on private associations or firms for free office space. This physical arrangement would incidentally have the virtue of giving the Commission's staff the benefit of closer association with the Committee staff.

5. As it refers projects to the Committee on Medical Care the Commission should ask for advice on only those question on which the Committee is equipped to advise. Those questions differ from project to project. On some types of questions the Commission may obtain helpful advice; on others, the Committee's judgment may be no better than that of the Commission which has the responsibility and might as well struggle with the problem without reference to the Committee. These differences among

questions come from that fact that many of the matters the Committee deals with do not have much to do with medical science; they only involve in varying degrees medical scientists.

For example, a department submits a project which is based upon a plan recommended by the Committee on Medical Care. No purpose is served by asking the Committee whether it favors the project. The Committee has offered a product; it is up to the Commission to make the painful decision whether to recommend to the Governor and General Assembly that the necessary appropriation be made. But the Committee might be asked a different question: "We have this project and six other proposed by the department of X. We shall be unable to approve all of them in the current year. What is your judgment about the relative urgency of these projects?" Medical science has no answer to this question, but the judgment of the Committee might well be based on considerations not adequately appreciated by the Commission. Or the Commission may have doubts about a departmental project. It could request the Committee to assemble a panel of consultants to consider questions such as whether the quantitative estimates of need are plausible, whether the project as planned represents the most economical way of attaining the desired and, whether the plan for project operation adequately ties in with related services, and so forth.

Unless the Commission raises such questions with the Committee on Medical Care it tends to slough off on the Committee matters that are its own responsibility. The Commission occupies a different position and must play a different role from that of its

Committee. The Committee is confronted by a large number of projects from different departments, all urged as of the highest priority. It must make a kind of decision that need not concern the Committee on Medical Care. The Committee may favor a project; the Commission may reject it; both may be right given the different kinds of questions with which they must cope.

6. These comments about the role of the Committee with respect to capital improvement proposals should not be permitted to obscure the fact that the Committee's work in the conduct of planning studies is a far more important part of its work. To make the best use of the Committee it should be burdened as little as possible with routine matters and should be encouraged to push ahead with its more fundamental inquiries.27/

Staff Organization and Needs

The management of a staff even as small as that of the Planning Commission carries with it many worrisome problems. To explore them in detail in a report would lead us into minutia, which have been the subject of conversations with the Chairman and the Director. For the record, however, several matters should be noted as questions which will become more important if the Commission chooses to follow the recommendations of this report for the extension of its activities.

1. As these changes occur the duties of the Commission's Director will change. For years the Commission staff was little more

---

27/ In these remarks I am moved by the fact that members of the Committee on Medical Care do some work, cheerfully enough, on capital improvement projects that might as well be done by Commission staff. A business man who devotes time to community service can ordinarily leave his business for a few days and the customers continue to flow in. A surgeon, however, who makes the same contribution sees his overhead continue as income ceases.

than a one-man organization, a circumstance that placed upon the Director a large proportion of the substantive work of the Commission. As the situation has begun to alter and presumably will continue to change, the job of the Director will consist more largely of tasks such as the following: (a) the recruitment of staff, a matter of urgent importance; (b) the leadership and management of staff, a duty of rather considerable intricacy when the staff is engaged in the kinds of work a planning commission conducts; (c) the preparation, with staff assistance, of materials for the consideration of the Commission along with all the work necessary to make the Commission a more effectively functioning body; (d) the organization of such special studies as the Commission authorizes; and (e) the miscellany of activities necessary to keep staff work moving. In short, the Commission is moving into the stage where the success of the Director is to be judged more by how well he develops his staff associates and what they produce than by the substantive planning work he does himself.

2. It is recommended that the Director designate, with the approval of the Commission, a member of the professional staff to act as his deputy in his absence. This is not a suggestion that there need be a deputy director with continuing functions as such, but that such a person be designated to act in the Director's absence.

3. As the staff of the Commission is increased, even if it never extends beyond a half dozen professional members, the problem of the conduct of relations with the operating departments will become more vexing. Even if it has only a small staff, the

relations of an agency such as the Planning Commission with the operating departments can become marvelously snarled unless deliberate thought is given to keeping the lines of communication straight. The Director will need to give attention to the broad question of who has what responsibilities in departmental relations; the office policies on these matters will have to be governed to some extent by the qualities of existing and future staff. In any case, however, a somewhat broader delegation of such responsibilities will need to occur.

The internal organization of the Commission staff need not be elaborate, but a basic division of its work into units is in order. That division should not be so rigid as to prevent assignments of staff to whatever tasks are pressing at the moment; nor should the divisions be sharply separated compartments with no communication across divisional lines. The staff divisions in existence or projected by the Commission would provide the foundation for the development of the functions of the Commission as contemplated in this memorandum. Those basic units of organization together with some comments about the duties of each are as follows:

Capital Improvements Administrator. This existing unit has responsibility for the initial staff review of capital improvements requests and for the preparation of the annual report on capital improvements, with some staff and consulting assistance, under the supervision of the Director. The Administrator should have a couple of assistants capable of analyzing departmental requests and of maintaining relations with the operating departments. More adequate staffing of this aspect of the Commission's work should assure improved submissions by the departments, better information for the Commission on departmental projects and needs, and considerable reduction of the pressure of the review that now occurs between July 1 and September 15.

Chief of Planning Studies. The Director has recently designated a senior staff member to have a primary staff responsibility with respect to the 10-year programs under preparation by the operating departments. Although this work can not be completely separated from that of the review of annual proposals of projects, the considerations that argue for some administrative separation are worth noting. The review of specific capital projects tends to develop, and indeed probably requires, men with a skeptical attitude who will thoroughly dehydrate departmental proposals. On the other hand, the long-term planning operation, since it is in some respects a pioneering operation, requires the application of a different type of mind. The staff member with this assignment has the most difficult job of developing recommendations for Commission action in an uncharted field. Some of the potential lines of action have been indicated at an earlier point in this memorandum. If those potentialities turn out to be corret, the staff man working in this area should develop criteria for the appraisal of long term-plans, be able to serve as staff director for ad hoc committees, and in general serve as an idea man for the Director and the Commission in this field.

Chief of Local and Regional Assistance. To make a beginning the field of assistance to local planning the Commission needs a person trained and skilled in city planning. An imaginative individual with some initiative and drive could soon carve out a sphere of usefulness for himself and, in time, an associate. As may be surmised from the earlier discussion of the problems and possibilities in this field in Maryland, it is desirable to seek out a person willing to forget the textbook answers and to apply all his own ingenuity and whatever wisdom he can tap to contrive new modes of operation in this field of new and perplexing problems.

Director of Studies, Committee on Medical Care. This staff unit has been long established, but the post has been vacant for a long time and

has been only recently filled. The primary responsibility of this unit is to service the Committee on Medical Care and its subcommittees. In the past the director of studies has conducted investigations for the Committee, either alone or with the assistance of consultants, and presumably this pattern of work will continue. The director of studies will, of necessity, be concerned with the capital improvement requests and the long-term programs of some departments of the State government, a circumstance that will necessitate a close co-ordination of his work with that of the staff members concerned with these matters generally.

Chief, Office of Economic Studies. If the Commission wishes to enter the field of economic and industrial studies, it will need an economist to head this work. Perhaps at the outset he could use an assistant, but some time should be spent in consultation with specialists in the determination of the types and methods of inquiry most likely to be profitable.

All these are, of course, only basic and continuing staff needs. A small staff can both accomplish a great deal and more than earn its keep, but it needs to be supplemented for particular studies as it demonstrates their usefulness and the need for their conduct. One method of small scale supplementation is by the short-term employment of consultants. The Commission should invariably make the strongest case in its budget requests for an adequate sum for this purpose. Beyond such small-scale supplementation of the continuing staff, if the Commission really achieves its potentialities, it will need to supplement its continuing staff on a larger scale temporarily for the conduct of individual planning studies.[28/] These needs will

---

28/ An example of the type of situation is that provided by the planning studies currently being conducted by the Baltimore Regional Planning Council. The Commission's Director took the leadership in arranging for the study and the Commission, with federal aid, employed a special staff to do the detailed work.